

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
April 6, 2010**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on April 6, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Spokely in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Snyder, Worthington, Vitas, Young & Spokely

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Reg Murray, Senior Planner
Lance E. Lowe, AICP, Associate Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PLEDGE OF ALLIGIENCE

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

V. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. TREE PERMIT- 123 RECREATION DRIVE (RECREATION PARK LOOP TRAIL) FILE# TP 10-2.** The applicant requests approval of a Tree Permit to allow construction of a pedestrian trail which encroaches within the Critical Root Zone (CRZ) of approximately ninety (\pm 90) Native Trees. A Tree Permit is required as the amount of encroachment exceeds 20% of the trees' CRZ. No trees are anticipated for removal.

Planner Lowe presented the proposed Recreation Park Loop Trail project and potential tree impacts.

Chairman Spokely noted that the only entitlement before the Commission is a tree permit.

Commissioner Worthington asked about the connectivity of the trail to other trail facilities. Is this project consistent with the City's General Plan?

Planner Lowe clarified that the design of the park trail has been adopted by the Auburn Recreation District and is not within the Planning Commission's purview tonight.

The park trail and its impacts relative to trees are within the Planning Commission's review and consideration.

Commissioner Worthington asked Auburn Recreation Districts' Administrator Mr. Kahl Muscott to discuss the Auburn Recreation Park Trail project.

Commissioner Young asked about the alternate trail alignments A&B and tree impacts for these alternative alignments.

Planner Lowe replied that trail alignment options A&B are no longer considered as part of the trail alignment options.

Commissioner Snyder asked about the Planning Commission's review of this Tree Permit and questioned whether or not the City Planning Commission has jurisdiction at all.

Chairman Spokely asked about the grading of the property with respect to the tree impact percentages.

Pamela Vann, Auburn Recreation District Landscape Architect, introduced herself and responded to questions from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Worthington was glad to see the improvements to the park.

Ms. Vann noted that the trail would be ADA compliant, but was not designed as a Class I bike path.

Commissioner Young asked if exercise stations would be located along the trail?

Mr. Muscott replied that such facilities were considered; however, due to the budget, these features could not be added.

Commissioner Vitas asked if the trail was fully funded?

Ms. Vann replied that the trail was fully funded.

Chairman Spokely inquired about the designation of the trail with respect to its design. Is there going to be a centerline stripe down the middle of the path?

Ms. Vann replied that no stripe is being proposed.

Chairman Spokely asked about the grading and the slopes adjacent to the path.

Ms. Vann noted that the grades adjacent to the path are not proposed to be steep and would be as minimal as possible.

Commissioner Snyder asked about the City associated costs with this application.

Ms. Vann noted that the City costs have been minimal and that the majority of the studies and plans that have been prepared would have been prepared regardless of the City's permitting process.

Commissioner Snyder **MOVED** to adopt the Planning Commission Resolution 10-6 for the Recreation Park Trail as presented.

Commissioner Vitas **SECONDED** the motion.

AYES:	Snyder, Worthington, Vitas, Young, & Spokely
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

The motion was approved.

VI. COMMISSION BUSINESS

Planner Murray discussed the Planning Commission priorities list with the Planning Commission.

Chairman Spokely inquired about outstanding priorities that are dated since 2007 and whether or not such items should be removed and/or reprioritized.

Planner Murray noted that staff is continuing to work on the individual tasks as time permits and recommends that these items remain on the list as some items may be incorporated into a larger comprehensive zoning code update, while other components may simply need minor editing to update.

Commissioner Snyder asked about item No. 4 relating to the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee for the Park Trail Master Plan Update. What is the status of the formation of the Trails Ad Hoc Committee?

Planner Murray explained that with recent staff reductions, staff has not been able to formalize the Ad Hoc Trail Committee.

Commissioner Snyder commented that he believed that volunteers should formalize the Ad Hoc Committee themselves to be approved by the City Council and does not believe that staff needs to initiate the formation of the committee.

Commissioner Worthington agreed, but noted that she believes that staff should attend the meetings to provide a City connection to the Ad Hoc Committee.

Commissioner Snyder agreed with the direction.

Commissioner Young agreed with the recommendation, but noted that staff should attend the meetings to provide direction to the Ad Hoc Committee.

Commissioner Snyder noted that appointed and elected officials, as well as citizens, would be on the Ad Hoc Committee to ensure that the Committee is moving in the right direction.

Commissioner Vitas liked the concept.

Commissioner Snyder recommended that a motion be crafted that requested that the City Council formalize an Ad Hoc Trails Committee to come up with an inventory of existing trails within the City, with minimal staff participation.

Commissioner Snyder, Worthington and Chairman Spokely all stated an interest in joining the Ad Hoc Committee.

Commissioner Snyder noted that the Ad Hoc Committee should only have two members as there may be an issue with the Brown Act.

Commissioner Snyder also noted that grant funding may be available for park master planning.

Commissioner Worthington agreed and noted that the Department of Transportation recently awarded grants to both the City of Roseville and City of Rocklin.

Chairman Spokely asked whether or not there is a Citywide landscaping and lighting district to maintain the lights in town.

Chairman Spokely posed the question as to whether or not a common design standard should be considered with Street lighting within the City.

Chairman Spokely noted that the City should adopt a street lighting standard and would like to see the City adopt design standards for the City.

Commissioner Snyder noted that a street light standard has been adopted for the Streetscape project.

Chairman Spokely inquired about the parking standards item on the list. Is this relating to the traffic study?

Planner Murray explained that the item related to the City's parking standard that has not been updated for a number of years and the desire of former Planning Commissioners to update the City's parking standards.

Planner Murray also noted that at the next City Council meeting, the Council will discuss the traffic study relating to parking enforcement.

Chairman Spokely noted that he just wanted to make sure that a duplication of efforts was not taking place.

Planner Murray noted that the parking standards and traffic study is not a duplication of efforts.

Commissioner Snyder noted that the parking discussion will focus on the Brewery Lane area. Commissioner Snyder also noted that a different methodology is being used to come up with new parking standards.

Commissioner Worthington noted that she was familiar with the new parking methodology and the standard seems very attractive. The book is entitled "The High Cost of Free Parking"

Chairman Spokely recommended that the discussion be continued and that he would present samples of design standards that other jurisdictions are using.

Commissioner Worthington noted that the Historic Design Review Commission (HDRC) is a group that has not met for quite a long time. Is there a requirement that the HDRC meet a certain number of times per year?

Planner Murray noted that there is not a set requirement to meet and that there have been very few HDRC applications needing HDRC review since the Planning Commission has delegated many of the tasks to staff.

Chairman Spokely asked whether or not the Commission should continue the discussion?

Planner Murray recommended that perhaps if the Commission wanted to discuss the matter further, that the Commission could continue the Planning Commission priorities discussion to the next meeting.

The Commissioners inquired about the Baltimore Ravine field trips.

Mike Emmert 10940 Oak View Terrace introduced himself and inquired how the public would be noticed of the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan field trips? What is the process for notifying the public?

Planner Murray replied that the Baltimore Ravine site visits would be publically noticed hearings. Notice would be published in the local paper; to residents within the project vicinity, and on the public display case in front of the City Hall.

Commissioner Snyder asked if the developer is inviting the public to view the property?

Planner Murray replied absolutely.

Commissioner Snyder asked how an applicant would be notified.

Planner Murray noted that in addition to the public notice in the news paper, and display on the public display case in front of City Hall, anyone wishing to be noticed of any future

meetings, could simply forward their request to the Community Development Department and the Department will provide them with a notice.

VII. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

- A.** City Council Meetings
None
- B.** Future Planning Commission Meetings
None
- C.** Reports
None

VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

Commissioner Snyder noted that the Chamber of Commerce is putting on an ADA workshop to discuss Americans with Disabilities Act and compliance with ADA requirements.

Commissioner Snyder also noted the Chamber will also be holding a discussion regarding the Big Box on Luther Road whether it be a Costco or Wal-mart. The Chamber will be formalizing an opinion regarding this project at the meeting.

Commissioner Snyder also related that the Chamber is working on an electronic message board for the community.

Commissioner Young asked whether or not the sign would look like the one in Roseville.

Commissioner Snyder envisioned that the technology would be similar, but the sign would likely be much different considering Auburn's Historic character.

Chairman Spokely asked if Commissioner Snyder would like to request that this item be on a future Planning Commission agenda?

Commissioner Snyder replied that before he requests that the Planning Commission discuss this item, he would like to have the discussion with the City Manager to see if he is agreeable to this idea.

Commissioner Young asked if the City would need to change the sign regulations to allow for an electronic sign board?

Planner Murray noted that the sign would need formal review by staff, Cal-Trans, etc. and that likely a variance to the City's sign standards would need to be approved by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Snyder noted that the sign has a number of advantages, but does not seem to fit Auburn's character.

IX. FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

None

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lance E. Lowe, AICP, Associate Planner